
CRCR

PARK - USE STUDY

NOR'TY CAROLINA STATE PARIS
1938

# as a part of the <br> Park, Parkway and Recreational Area Study 

North Carolina
Department of Conservation and Development
and the North Carolina State Planning Board
in cooperation with

United States Depurtment of the Interior National Park Service

Assisiance in the preparation of these materials was furnished by the personnel of Work Projects Administration

Official Project Number 665-32-3-336

## Digitized by the Internet Archive in 2012 with funding from <br> LYRASIS Members and Sloan Foundation

PARK-USE STUDY--1938 TABLE CF CCNTENTS Page
Introduction ..... 1
. Sumary of findings ..... 3
Major analyses ..... 6
The parks studied ..... 6
Attendance ..... 7

1. Through the year ..... 7
Table 1 and Graph 1: Park attendance by check-weeks ..... 8
Table 2: Park attendences, with estimated seasonaltotals9
2. Holideys ..... 9
3. By day of week ..... 10
Table 3 and Graph 3: Park attendances, by day of week ..... 11
4. By period of dey ..... 12
Table 4 and Graph 4: Park attendences, by period of dey ..... 13
5. By weather ..... 13
Table 5 and Graph 5: Avercee attendance per week day, based on weather conditions ..... 14
6. By age-groups ..... 14
Table 6 and Graph 6: Park attendance, by age groups ..... 15
7. By residence ..... 16
Table 7 and Graph 7: Park attendance by residence ..... 16
8. By income and occupation ..... 16
Table 8 and Graph 8: Fark attendence, by income
groups ..... 18
O. By origin ..... 18
Table 9 and Graph 9: Park attendance, in-State and out-of-Str.te ..... 19
Ttble 10 and Graph 10: Out-of-State park patrons, neighboring end distant ..... 21
Table ll: In-State park attendances, by distance to indicated percentages ..... 23
Table 12 and Graph 12: Fark attendances as per- centages of the population within certain travel-distance zones ..... 24
Fark patrons' preferences ..... 25
l. Fork patrons' vacations ..... 25
9. Months used for vacations ..... 26
10. Annual expenditure on vacations ..... 26
Table 13 and Graph 13: vacations, average annual expenditure ..... 27
11. Where vacations are spent ..... 27
12. Preferences for recreational diversions ..... 28
13. Preferences for recreational travel ..... 28
14. Preferences in securing food ..... 29
15. Preferences for means of lodging ..... 30
(2)
Page
Table of contents--continued
More detailed analyses of park attendance - by parks ..... 30
16. Miount Mitchell ..... 31
Table 14 and Graph 14: Attendance, Mt. Mitchell, by month, 5 -year period ..... 32
Table 15 and Graph 15: Attendance, Mt. Mitchell, by day of week, 5-year period ..... 33
Table 16 and Graph 16: Attendance, Mt. Nitchell, in-State and out-of-State, by years ..... 34
17. Cape Hatteras ..... 35
18. Morrow Mountain ..... 36
19. Hanging Rock ..... 37
20. Fort Macon ..... 39Table 17 and Graph 17: Attendance at Fort Macon,by month, 193839
Table 18 and Graph 18: Attendance at Fort Miacon, by month, 7 -year period ..... 41
Table 19 and Graph 19: Attendance at Fort Macon, by day of week, 7-year period ..... 42
Table 20 and Graph 20: Attendance at Fort Facon, in-State and out-of-State, by years ..... 43
Appendix 1. The accuracy of summer totels estimated from spot-week checkings ..... 44
Appendix 2. How the total summer attendance was coputedfor Mount Mitchell46
Appendix 3. How the total summer attendance at Mor=uw Nountain was computed ..... 47
Appendix 4. Number of persons, cars, and persons per car
attending North Carolina perks, 1938 ..... 48
Appendix 5. Park attendance, by age-groups, checkers' records and park patrons' statements ..... 49
Appendix 6. Park attendance, by age-groups, by months (with rraph 2l) ..... 50Appendix 7. Park patrons' vacations, average nuruber andaverage distance traveled, by income groups51
Index ..... 52
(2)

## PARK USE STUDY-1938 NORTH CARCLINA <br> INTRODUCTION

Basic to the preparation of a long-range State recreational plan is a complete and detailed knowledge of the travel and recreational habits of the people of the State.

This report embodies the results and findings of studies which were made in five North Carolina State parks during one selected week per month of the summer season of 1938* to determine the park-attendance and park-use habits of North Carolina people and visiting tourists. The check was extended into one of the early weeks of November in three of the parks in order to obtain samples of off-season use to compare with peak-season figures. This Statepark study was taken at the same tine as a similar study of the proposed National Seashore area, which includes Cape Hatteras, the findings of which are presented in a separate report. Cape Hatteras State Park, however, appears in both reports since it is a pert of the proposed National Seashore.

The oricinal field data were collecter ${ }^{\circ}$ : Civilian Conservation Corps errolees in Cape Hatteras, Hancil ç Pơk, lorrow lountain and inount ${ }^{f+t}$ tchell State parks, and by regular park personnel and through regtstration records in Fort Kacon State Park, Additional informatior was secured from the park patrons themselves through the reru:־ of questionnaire blonks handed to them by the field checkers. Troulation, recapitulation and checking of data,

[^0]and oreparation of tables and illustrations were done through the aid of Work Projects Administration projects 3398 and 4672. Analysis of data and preparation of the report is the work of Assistant State Supervisor Raymond Sydansk of the National Park Service, Superintendent of State Farks Thomas W. Morse of the North Carolina Depertment of Conserration and Develonment and Project Supervisor L. D. Burling.

In the preparation of this report accuracy has not been sacrificed for readability, and there has been a real attempt to separate fact from inference. The line separating these two may sometimes, however, be almost academic, especially where averages are determined from a sufficient number of pertinent data.

There is a uniformity in certain of the results for all of the parks which is independent of observer, day of week, weather or location. There is lack of uniformity, in certain of the findings, between tourist or scenic parks and active-use parks. There are minor individual variations where the data involve matters of opinIon (age of car occupants, for example) and unanimities where the thing observed is an actual fact. There is persistence where it might be expected, and discrepancy where uniformity would arouse comment, in certain of the percentages based upon park-patron data. There are noticeable correlations or explainable variations between field checkers' figures, park patrons' statements and Census statistics. All these facts not only support the accuracy of the methods used in gathering the material and adopted in its analysis, but, of greater importance, (a) they confirm the accuracy of those findings which represent a contribution to the general problem of park use,
and (b) they indicate that the travel and recreational habits of North Carolinians vary little over the State.

For ease in reading, this report has been divided into five sections as follows:
(a) Summary of findings - A brief surmary of the more important findings of the report, beginning on page 3 .
(b) Major Analyses - Analysis of the findings of the study, by subject, beginning on page 6 .
(c) Perk-patron preferences - Analysis of the results of the questionnaire, beginning on page 25.
(d) More detailed analyses of park attendance - By parks, beginning on page 30.
(e) Appondix - Detailed tables and explanations of methods used, beginning on page 44 .

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

1. North Cerolina State parks fall into two distinct service types. Mount Mitchell and Cape Hatteras state parks form one group referred to herein as scenic or vacat ourins. These areas drew their patronage from a great distance, crinaratively few visitors are repaeters, most visitors are usually on Vacation and attendance is spread evenly through the week. These parks are of superb scenic or scientific charecter and offer a minimum of day-use facilities. Fort Macon, scenicwhistoric, belongs also in this group. The active-use parks, on the other hand (Liorrow Nountain enj Hanging Rock), are not of such superlative scenic character but they possess rather intense

day-use facilities. These parks draw the major part of their attendance from within thirty miles. Visitors are constant repeaters; they come to spend only a day or a portion of a day between work periods, and usually over seventy-five percent of a week's attendance comes on Sunday.
2. The North Carolina park-use season is from June 1 through Labor Day, with local variations extending the season earlier or later in specialized cases.
3. Holiday attendances, July 4 and Labor Day, usually equal or slightly exceed the summer-peak Sunday.
4. Fifty to ninety percent of the week's attendance in active-use parks comes on Sunday; the rest is spread evenly through the week. In the scenic parks, attendance runs evenly through the week, Sunday being only one to five percent greater than the heaviest week day.
5. For certain recreational uses, attendance at State parks seems to vary generally in accordance with the weether conditions on the day preceding the day of use.
6. The great bulk of the average day's attendance comes in the afternoon (from forty to seventy percent). The large morning attendance usuelly errives just before noon, staying on into the afternoon.
7. In both scenic and active-use parks, but especially in the case of sceniz parks, the percentage of children using the parks j.s much smaller than one would be led to expect from the percentage
of children in the population of the Stete as a whole.
8. Most park users are urban residents $(68-85 \%)$.
9. The percentage of park users in the first three of the income groups (below $\$ 3000$ ) does not depart redically from their corresponding percentages in the State as a whole. But the percentage of users with an income larger than 3000 a year is much larger than we should expect from the same State-wide figures. The percentage of park users in the lowest income group (below ${ }^{\$ 1200}$ ) is considerably smaller in relation to its percentage in the total State population than is the case in any other income group.
10. Professional and technical people outnumber all other occupational groups in the scenic parks. In the active-use parks, however, skilled labor holds first place.
11. Less than five percent of the attendance at activeuse parks is from out-of-State. Scenic parks receive from twentyfive to seventy-five percent of their use from out-of-State. Mount Mitchell is highest in this respect. From twenty-one to forty-nine percent of all out-of-Stc.te attendance comes from neighboring States.
12. The greatest use of active parks is from within thirty miles. Beyond this distance, the percentage of the populetion using the area is much smeller, but quite constent.

1\%. Yearly expenditures for recreation vary little in all income groups except the: over $\$ 3000$. Families in the latter group spend almost twice as much as those in eny of the other groups.
14. The automobile is by far the most popular conveyance used for transportation to the parks studied.

## IIAJOR ANALYSES

## A-The Parks Studied

Five State parks were studied during the summer of 1938. They included three outstanding scenic or historic purks; namely, Cape Hatteras, Fort Macon and Mount liitchell, and two scenic but primarily active-use parks - Hanging Rock and Norrow Nountain. The former parks, purely scenic in attraction and possessing á minimum of active-use facilities, drew attendance fron all parts of the Stute and country to enjoy attractions not to be found elsewhere. Norrow Mountain and Hanging Rock, on the other hand, were more local in their appeal, receiving repeated use from the people living within shorter distances of the area. The attractions in these latter two parks are not limited to passive scenic, scientific ond historic use, as in the former three, but include provisions for such recreational uses as swimaing, boating, camping, picnicking, etc. The latter facilities, existing and potential, account for the repeated local use of these parks. Differences, both in type of parks ank in services rendered, will be found reflected in many of the pager if the report. These differences in the putterns of attendance aru we $\mathrm{v}^{\circ}$ the two types of parks s.ouid be closely studied becalive the devoionment of future areas, oi expansion of existing ones, will ha"e to be planned in accordance with the type of use to which each perk naturally dedicates itself.

Neiter forrow Nountain nor Hanginc Rock State parks were officially opened during 1938. The attendance, therefore, was confined to those who heard of the area by word of nouth or read of it

in nation-wide publicity, principally on rocid mps. Total attendence, and especially local attendnce from within $s$ thirty-mile redius, is therefore expected to increase ennsiderably fifter the . perks nre officielly dedicated to public use.
B. - Attendence.

1. Throuch the yerr.

All prirks are primarily sumer-use areos. The senson of heavy use in North Caraline, however, is longer then in Stetes studied farther to the north. Althnugh herviest us: is from July 4th to Labor Day, $6 s$ in more nortrorn States, the months of June end Septamber receive quite heavy use, ennugh in mest coses to justify full operntion.

Attendence is very low in the winter (see Novamber figures, Table 1 and Graph l) and builds up slowly throuch the sprine to $\varepsilon$ peak in lrte June or eerly July (Morrnw Mountsin, for exmple) which is mrinteined or even increased in Aufust (rort Mcon). After Labor Day, attendence slowly drops off to the low winter levol. as illustreted_in the Me.unt Nitchell end Fort Macen figures of Graph 14 and Gropt 18.

```
(For Trble l, sea following pege)
```

TABLE 1
FANK NTMDANCES FCR 1938, BY CHECK-WEEKS

| Month | Fount Mitchell |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cipe } \\ & \text { Hatteras } \\ & \text { State } \\ & \text { Pirk** } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Morrow Nount: in |  | Honging Rock |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fort } \\ & \text { Facon*** } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. | 者 | No. $\%$ | No. | \% | No. | \% | No. | \% |
| dit y | - | - | 33022.0 | - | - | 1073 | 33.9 | $8: 0$ | 8.5 |
| June | - | - | 28919.3 | 541 | 15.3 | 548 | 17.3 | 1870 | 19.2 |
| Tuly | - | - | 21514.4 | 1316 | 37.2 | 768 | 24.3 | 3019 | 31.0 |
| Aucust* | $\begin{aligned} & 662 \\ & 608 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 43.4 \\ & 39.8 \end{aligned}$ | 29519.7 | 1150 | 32.5 | 494 | 15.6 | 2895 | 29.5 |
| September | 256 | 16.8 | 21914.6 | 175 | 4.9 | 280 | 8.9 | 898 | $9 \cdot 2$ |
| Sovember | - | - | 15010.0 | 358 | 10.1 | - | - | 201 | 2.6 |
| Totals | 1526 |  | 1498 | 3540 |  | 3163 |  | 9723 |  |
| Averuge Fer week | 509 |  | 248 | 708 |  | 633 |  | 1621 |  |

* Two check-weeks in August.
** Not counting unlicensed cers.
*** The ectual totals for the months listed.

As observed from the estimeted totil summer ettendence listed in Trble 2 (and not counting Fort Macon), the active-use reriss, Morrow Mountrin end Henging Rock, recived the heaviest totrl usage. This is to be expected, but it should be remombered thet the total figures herein cited for lforrow Mount•in ind Henging Rock will incresse five to ton times when the perks are officislly open for use. Mount Mitchell end Cope Hatterəs fiॄures, however, can b: t.ken :s serson:l $: v e r$ ges unless conditions of accessibility to than are modified. Fiॄures for Fort Nircon cin ilso be tiken as seasonill civerisees unless more ictive-use ficilities :re provided.
GRAPH 1



TABLE 2
TOTAL PARK ATTENLANCE FIGURES, 1038, NTTH ESTI ATED TOTAL SEASONAL FJGURES


Weeks for
which
figures
were

| secured | 3 | 6 | 4.5 | 5 | 52 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Park
patrons
recorded
during
summer

| season only | 1,526 | 1,348 | 3,182 | 3,163 | $9,522 \quad 18,741$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Estimated
total
summer

| attendance | 7,460 | 5,400 | 21,700 | 12,650 | 9,522 | 56,732 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

* Does not include persons treveling in Government vehicles (largely trucks with C.C.C. workers) nor locel residents traveline in unlicensed "beach cars" (See page 30).
** Actual figures for 1938.

2. Holidays.

The two summer holidays, July 4 th and Labor Day, not only start and terminate the heaviest-use senson but they are usually the two peck days of the whole year. July 4 th holiday has been observed to be the heuviest-use period of the year in nearly all perks. This is especially true when this holidey falls on a week-end. On Labor Doy, as observed, there are smaller uttendances than on July 4th, but

they usually efual the peak Sundays of August. After Labor Dey, a steady decline in attendrance at all perks was recorded.
3. By dry of week.

Tourist trevel (people treveling on vacr.tion) hos no set pattern of use during the week. The tourist perks - outstinding scenic arecs, such as Mount litchell and Cepe Hetteres - received an even pittern of use through the week, with Sundey just e little higher than other doys. (Table 3 and Grabh 3). The mure local activeuse perks, however, received the grest bulk of their ettendince on Sunday; Henging Rock, for exemple, received eighty-six percent of its ettendrnce on Sundry. The percentrge of rettendrnce on Sundry at Morrow Mountrin ( $4 \uparrow .2 \%$ ), though not is grest ns sit Manging Rock, mey be expected to rise when the perk is opened, end come closer to thr Henging Rock pettern, which is siriler to the pattern of use of Stute parks in neighboring Ste.tes.

The difforence in the patturns of use between active-use parks end the outstending scenic preis is primerily the difference between tourists (whether in-stete or out-of-Stete) :nd locel people, recrantion bent. This is eptly illuitreted in Greph 16 which shows the totsl in-Steto end out-of-Stete ittendence eit Wount Mitchell ovur period of inive yu:rs. The totrl veristions by dey of week ere slifht, end smell encugh to be ofrfuctly netural. When the inSt: te end out-of-Strte drta ere studied seprretely, howover, the cherreteristic potterns of cach show up (Graph 15). It is observed thet the cut-of-Stre attindence e.t Nount ilitchell runs rither evenly through the werk with a slight decline on wook-ends, whereas the in-


St te attendr.ncs runs evenly through the week with increased weekends comperable to the pattern of liorrow lfountain und Hengine Rock perks.

None of the week-end figures at lount ritchell, Henging Rock or Sorrow lountain, howevrr, cin be comp:ied with the figures for Cupe latteris beciuss at $C$ pe Hatteras the figures cover spotweeks running from lionday throufh Sundey. $\therefore . t$ oll other pirks, the given Sundry figures are not for the Sundey following the given Scturd: y but for the Sundey preceding the iven Monday, - in these pr.rks, therefore, the spot-weeks run from Sund:y through Saturdey.

TABII 3
PARK ATTMNDANCSS, ACHUL ANJ BY FEPCENTACES, BY DIY CF EEK

| Dey of week | hount Mitchell |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Crpe } \\ & \text { Hatterss } \end{aligned}$ |  | Norrow Mountein |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { H: neing } \\ & \text { Rock } \end{aligned}$ |  | Fort ivic.con |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. | $\%$ | No. | \% | No. | 9 | No. | $\%$ | No. | \% |
| Iondey | 189 | 12.4 | 166 | 11.1 | 204 | 5.8 | 63 | 2.1 | 931 | 6.9 |
| Tuesdi.j | 202 | 13.2 | 196 | 13.0 | 215 | 6.1 | 74 | 2.3 | 1070 | 7.9 |
| dednesdey | 271 | 17.8 | 191 | 12.7 | 389 | 110 | 77 | 2.2 | 1185 | 8.8 |
| Thursdy | 178 | 11.7 | 217 | 14.4 | 277 | 7.8 | 43 | 1.5 | 1364 | 10.1 |
| Fridey | 220 | 14.4 | 251 | 16.7 | 299 | 8.4 | 45 | 1.5 | 1165 | 8.6 |
| Si tuadu | 138 | 9.0 | 103 | 12.8 | 091 | 1r. 7 | $14{ }^{4}$ | $4 \cdot 4$ | 1447 | 10.7 |
| Sunday | 328 | 21.5 | 284 | 19.3 | 1565 | 4.4 .2 | $272 i$ | 86.0 | 6329 | 46.9 |
| Toti.ls | 1526 | 100 | 1498 | 100 | 3540 | 10.) | 3163 | 100 | 13491 | 99.9 |

The pattern of i.ttendunco ct cotire-use perks resuires
thet ill are: and facility plenning be for the ettendrnce on the zivert ge Sunday. If parking space, swimnilig spoce, picnic spece, etc., re developed sufficiently to c:re for Sundiy crowds, they
为

LAILY ATTENDANCES AS PERCEINTACES CF TTIE TOTAL WEEKLY ATTENDANCES
1.938
$\begin{array}{llll}-100 & & \\ -90 & & \\ -80 & & \\ -70 & & \\ & & \\ -60 & \text { MTTCHETL } & \text { CAPE } & \text { FATTERAS }\end{array}$ MORROW $\begin{aligned} & \text { MOUNTAIN }\end{aligned}$

PERCENT

will be sufficient for the rest of the week. Extra larce days, on which ottendance is greatly in excess of the average Sunday, on the other hand, occur only three or four times during the season. These would not fustify oversize developments, portions of which would lie ide the remainder of the year. Judicious administration can reduce the great bulk of overloading, except July $\Lambda$ th and Lavor Day, by inducirg those planning large special events to scheaule them, whenever possible, on off-peak days.

## 4. By period of day.

```
(The attendance by period of day (Table 4 and si:4 ; 4. 4) in
```

lount Mitchell and Cepe Hatteras Stete parks is similer to that observed in nearby States. The bulk of the attendence in these parks arrived in the afternoon, a lesser number arriving in the morning (before noon), and a still smaller group in the evening (after 5 p.m.). The bulk of this heavy rorning attendance, however, was composed of persons arriving after 10 or 11 a.m. and spending $\varepsilon$ good portion of the sfternoon in the parks. Evening entrence int, ine parks was in ell cases small, but the perks were still being used in the evening by lite efternoon visitors. : The rosson for the solien efternoon attendence at Norrow Mountain and Hz neing Rock cer rut be explained without furtier study ffter the parks are onitcaliy opened. The heat of mid-day ney be keeoing peonle at hoie from noon till 4 p.m., but it is fer more likely due to the stiserce of fucilities for swimming and other forms of perk use. Additicnsl study should be undertaken to determine whit effect, if $\varepsilon n y$, the heat of mid-day will heve upon the afternoon use of piedmont and loviond rarks. 'It should be
observed, however, thet twenty-five to thirty-five percent of the total week's attendance may be expected on Sunday afternoon.

TABLE 4
PARK ATTMTDAITCE, BY PRYICD OF DAY

|  | Mount Mitchell |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cape } \\ & \text { Hatteras } \end{aligned}$ |  | Morrow Mountain |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hanging } \\ & \text { Rock } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. | $\%$ | No. | $\%$ | No. | $\%$ | No. | $\%$ |
| Morning | 381 | 25.0 | 405 | 27.0 | 1451 | 41.0 | 1470 | 46.5 |
| Afternoon | 1063 | 69.6 | 808 | 53.9 | 1487 | 42.0 | 1194 | 37.7 |
| Evening | 82 | $5 \cdot 4$ | 285 | 19.0 | 602 | 17.0 | 499 | 15.8 |
| Total | 1526 | 100 | 1498 | 100 | 3540 | 100 | 3163 | 100 |

5. By weather.

Only two narks, Cape Hatteras and Hanging Rock, recorded weather during the 1938 checking season (Table 5, Graph 5), but the results bear out the theory that attendance in parks is affected not by the weather of the day studied, but rather by the weather of preceding days. This is due, primarily, to the planning and preparation necessary for a trip to a park. ©n a fair Friday or Saturday, an average narty may plan an outing for Sunday and buy necessary foods and make all preparations. If the weather on Sunday is bad, the party usually goes anyway in the hope if a change in weather, rather than scran the well-laid plans and purchases. On the other hend, fow flans ire male on rainy deys for fair woather to follow. A suddea shange to fair weather usually $f=$ nds prosnective park users uneyuipned in plans or materials for a day in the park. |

This theory is borne out by the figures in Table 5. It



is observed that at Capc Hatteras State Park, where elaborate preparations are necessary before a visit, there was no rhyme nor reason to the relation of attendance and weather. In fact, the heaviest attendance happened to be on rainy deys. At Hanging Rock, on the other hand, no pre-visit preparations were necessary, because practically all visitors came only through curiosity to see what was being done, or to view the work completed. Such visits require a minimum of planning and consequently attendance ran in accordance with weather conditions, 1.e., very slight on rainy deys and heaviest (seventy percent) on fair days. Then the swimming and picnic facilities of this park are opened, and grecter family or party plans are needed than for just "going for a ride" as at present, the attendance in this park will lose its relationship to the weather on the day attended and will fall more closely in line with the weather of previous days.

TABLE 5
AVERAGE ATTENDANCE PER DAY, BASED UPON NEATHYT: CONDITICNS MEEK DAYS ONLY

|  | Cape Hatteras Average $\%$ |  | Henging Average | Rock $\%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainy | 81 | 50.9 | 9.0 | 29.2 |
| Cloucy | 32.6 | 20.5 | 5.3 | 17.2 |
| Cleer | 45.4 | 28.6 | 16.6 | 53.7 |

5. By cre groups.

The percentage of park ijsitors under ejejteen has been deterrinod in two weys: (a) by the field checkers, and (b) from the park petrons' statenents. A comparison of the results thus secured

$+\quad+\quad+$
（1）
＝
＝

BASED ON AVERAGE ATTENDANCE, WEATHER CONDITIONS WEEK DAYS ONLY
shows that the checkers are uniformly a little low in their estimates*. But the Park averages, at their best, represent little more than half of the average for the State as a whole (Table 6 and Graph 6), and prove that children are not adequately represented in our parks. This is most conspicuous in the scenic parks, and first vecame obvious when it was discovered that the summer closing of the schools had almost no effect uọn the percentage of children attending the National Seashore. For the active-use parks, the percentage of children almost doubles during the summer, and, at liorrow liountain (see fppendix 6), drops in September, to one-seventh of the summervacation averace. Park patrons' statements record "children in the family" and "children in the party" and prove that the children are not left et home. The park patronage is simply derived from people who have smaller families than the average for the State.

TABLE 6
PARIK ATTENDANCE, BY ACE GEOUPS

| Mount Mitchell | Cape Hatteras | Morrow ioountain | Hzneing Rock | Totals <br> for the <br> four <br> parks | StateTotsls** |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. \% | No. \% | No. \% | NC. 分 | No. ${ }_{i}$ | No. | \% |

TInder $18 \quad 24215.9 \quad 250 \quad 16.7 \quad 680 \quad 19.2 \quad 889 \quad 28.1 \quad 226721.102545 .9$ Over $18128484.1124883 .3286080 .8 \quad 227471.9 \quad 855579.120954 .1$ Totals $\quad 1526100 \quad 1498100 \quad 3540100 \quad 3163100108221002234100$

* A table comparirg the checkers' figures and the perk patrons' figures will be found in Appendix 5 .
** In thousands, from 1930 Census figures.




## 7. By residence.

The park patrons' statements five residence data for 13.5
percent of the visitors to the State narks during the summer of 1938, and show that the information is applicable to the park-visitors group as a whole. The questionnaire followed the U. S. Census breakdown into urban, rural non-farm and rural-farm, and indicates (as Table 7 and Graph 7 make so startingly clear) that three times as meny of our park visitors are derived from the urban population as the percentage of city dwellers in the State would lead us to expect. Upon the same basis, also, our narks are visited by only one-sixth as many farmers as we should expect from their proportionate representation in the popuiation.

TABLE 7
PARK ATTENDANCE, BY RESIDENCE, AS GIVEN IN PARK PATRONS' STATMNENTS

|  | Lount <br> Nitchell |  | Cape <br> Hatteras |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Henging } \\ & \text { Rock } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | Totals for the three parks |  | Total for Stete as a whole* |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. | \% | No. | \% | No. | \% | No. | \% | No. | \% |
| Urban | 75 | 35.3 | 59 | 81.9 | 43 | 68.3 | 177 | 79.4 | 811 | 25.7 |
| Rural non-farm | 7 | 8.0 | 8 | 11.1 | 12 | 10.1 | 27 | 12.1 | 759 | 24.1 |
| Rural -farm | 6 | 6.8 | 5 | 7.0 | 8 | 12.7 | 19 | 8.5 | 1582 | 20.2 |

* In thousands, from 1930 Census fiçures.

8. By income ind occupation.

Comparison of income groups, park-visitor and State, is complicated by the different break-downs used in questionnaire (Table 8) and Census*, but Eraphic and analytic methods were used

[^1](ancen

GRAPH 7
PARK ATTENDANCE, BY RESIDENCE,
W GIVEN IN PARK PATRONS' STATH:ENTS
1938

to achieve a direct comparison between the two break-downs, and the result is given in Graph 8. In this, the income groups (parkvisitor and State) are the same, and the ertaph clearly indicates that the high-income class is numerically larger (four times, to be exact) then its representation in the State as a whole would lead one to expect. The averafe incomc received by scenic-park visitors, also, is larger than that received bv those casually attending activeuse parks, as would be expected, and the average income of each park group (scenic and active-use) exceeds the State-wide average. This is due partly to the presence, amone park patrone, of relatively few low-income receivers, but more largely to the presence of an unusually large number of high-saluried people.

This affects the occupational statistics as well. The park patrons' statements indicate (a) that the professional and technicel group is found in equal numbers in scenic porks, irrespective of differences in the parks themselves, end (b) that this relatively high-salaried group is twice as woll represented in scenic parks as it is in active-use parks. Skilled labor makes up a majority of the patronage at Hanging Rock (the only active-use park for which ficures are aveileble), and is there represented by a number as laree as professional and technicul ind the menufecturing and mechanical industries combined. At the scenic parks, on the other hand, there were five professional and technical employees to every one classed as a skilled leborer.
(For Table 8, see page 18)

TABLE 8
PARK ATTENDANCE, BY TICOIE GROUFS, IT-STATE, FROI! FARK IATRONS' STATEN ENTS

|  | Mount litchell | Cape <br> Hatteras | Hanging <br> Rocik | Totels for the three parks | Totals for the State* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. \% | No. \% | No. \% | No. \% | No. \% |
| 0-\$1200 | $4 \quad 18.2$ | 731.8 | 1020.0 | $21 \quad 22.3$ | 23133.2 |
| \$1201-\$2000 | $6 \quad 27.3$ | $5 \quad 22.7$ | 1632.0 | $27 \quad 28.7$ | 26137.5 |
| \$2001-\$3000 | $5 \quad 22.7$ | $5 \quad 22.7$ | 1326.0 | $23 \quad 24.5$ | 18126.0 |
| Over \%3000 | $7 \quad 31.8$ | $\begin{array}{lll}5 & 22.7\end{array}$ | 1122.0 | $23 \quad 24.5$ | 23 3.3 |
| Total | 22 | 22 | 50 | 94 | 696 |

* The Census breakdown, for the State as a whole, is in groups as follows: under $\$ 600, \$ 600-\$ 1000, \$ 1000-\$ 2500$, over $\$ 2500$, and the respective figures are, in thousands, 185, 223, 248 end 40 . Such a breakdom cannot be compared, directly or indirectly with the breakdown of the questionnaire (lefthend column). Grephic methods heve therefore been used to plot and recompute a breckdown for the State as a whole which can be compared with the State park figures, and this is given in the column to which this footnote is attached, in thousends.


## 9. By origin.

The percentage of in-State and out-of-State park visitors to each Dark is known to us from the checkers' records of the car license numbers. The actual percentages in the individual parks vary considerably (see Trble 9, Graph 9). At active-use parks like Hancing Rock, there are only three and $\varepsilon$ half out-of-State cars in every hundred that enter the park, while in liount Mitchell park, fifty-five in every hundred cars bear out-of-State licenses.

In computing the in-State and out-of-State percentages of the total estimated summer attendance of 56,732 people it is neces-
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sary to anrly the individual park percentrges to each of the estimated attendances which were given in Table 2. The result is given in Toble 9 under "Totcl estimsted summer sittend: nce" which yields 4 total estimated in-Stete summer ittendence of 47,889 people. The out-of-Stite total is 8,843 , or one person in every six.

TABLE 9.
FARK ATTENDANCE, IN-STATE AND OUT-CF-STATE, BY PERCENTAGES

|  | Mount Nitchell |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Cape } \\ \text { Hatteras } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Morrow } \\ & \text { Mountain } \end{aligned}$ |  | Hanging <br> Rock |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fort } \\ & \text { Miecon* } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | Totel |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. | $\%$ | No. | \% | No. | \% | No. | 9 | No. | \% | No. | \% |
| $\frac{\text { Total }}{\text { attend- }}$ $\frac{\text { ance for }}{\text { checked }}$ weeks | 1189 | 100 | 1498 | 100 | 3540 | 100 | 3163 | 100 | 9522 | 100 | 18912 | 100 |
| InState | 529 | 44.5 | 1165 | 78 | 3363 | 95 | 3059 | 97 | 7522 | 79 | 15638 | 82 |
| Out-ofStcte | 660 | 55.5 | 333 | 22 | 177 | 5 | 104 | 3 | 2000 | 21 | 3274 | 18 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\text { Total }}{\frac{\text { esti- }}{\text { mated }}} \\ & \text { sunmer } \\ & \text { atteni- } \\ & \text { ance } \end{aligned}$ | 7460 | 100 | 5400 | 100 | 21700 | 100 | 12650 | 100 | 5522 | 100 | 56732 | 100 |
| In- <br> State | 3320 | 44.5 | 4193 | 78 | 20615 | 95. | 12233 | 97 | 7522 | 79 | 47889 | 84 |
| Out-ofStete | 4140 | 55: 5 | 1201 | 22 | 1085 | 5 | 417 | 3 | 2000 | 21 | 8843 | 16 |

* Actual total figures for the sumer ere cvailable for Fort Macon.
(1)
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## FARK ATTEDDANCE, IN-STATE AND CUT-CF-STATE 1938

BY PERCENTAGES
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The in-State total of 47,889 park visitors represents almost exactly 2.2 percent of the $2,223,9,25^{*}$ white population of the Stete.

There are duplications, however, because individuals visit the same park more than once, and because individuals visit more than one park. The nu:bor who do the latter can be approximated from the park patrons' statements, which indicate thet patrons were each planning to visit an average of 1.3 parks. If this everage is general, the number of actual verk users during the summer of 1938 falls to 36,840 . In other words, only one person in every sixty residents of the State visited a North Carolina State park during the summer season of 1938 .

Two of the State parks are as readily accessible to neighboring State visitors as to North Carolina people themselves. These two parks are Hanging Rock, only fifteen miles by road from the Virginia line, or closer than it is to Winston-Salem, and Cape Heteras, only eighteen miles farther from Norfolk, Virginia, then it is from Elizabeth City. For this reason the attendance figures of origin have been divided into two groups: (a) neighboring and (b) other more distant Stetes (Table 10 :nd Graph 10).

Immediate proxinity to á Siate line gives Henging Rock different percentage relationship between neighboring-State and total out-of-State figures then is true for Morrow Mountain, which is also an active-use park but is located nearer the center of the Stete. For each of the scenic perks (Nount ritchell and Cape Hatteras), the percentages indicate clearly that the neighborine. Stetes contribute * 1930 Census figures.

one-third of the total out-of-State attendance.
The very large percentage of distant-State patrons at Norrow Mountain (higher than for the scenic parks) is still unexplained. The figures are too large to be accidental, but may be partly due to the fact that the name occurs upon oil-company hichway maps and that the park is only fifty miles from US Highway No. 1.

TABLE 10
OUT-OF-STATE FAPK PATRONS, NEIGHBORING AND DISTANTT

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Wount* } \\ & \text { Mitchell } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cape** } \\ & \text { Hatteras } \end{aligned}$ | Morrow*** Mountain | Hanging Rock |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Neighboring Stetes: |  |  |  |  |
| Number of States | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Number of people | 211 | 125 | 37 | 51 |
| Percentage of out-of-State total | 31.7 | 37.5 | 20.9 | 49.0 |
| Distant States: |  |  |  |  |
| Number of States | 23 | 11 | 10 | 8 |
| Number of people | 454 | 208 | 140 | 53 |
| Percentage of out-of-State total | 68.3 | 62.5 | 79.1 | 51.0 |

* The neighboring States with their attendance figures are: Tennessee, 23; South Carolina, 140; Virginia, 48.
** The neighboring State is Virginiti.
*** The neighboring States with their attendance figures are: South Carolina, 27; Virginia, 10.

To learn the distances traveled by the park visitors in getting to the parks, the trivel diszences from perks to town of license registry were measured (Table 1l). Describing this table graphicelly, it gives, in miles, the radii of circles enclosing successively larger and larger percentages of the park attendence. The oercentages are regular, the necessary numbers of miles vary widely, especially with type of perk. As might be expected, the
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State, and this is to be seen in the fact that the scenic parks must be circumscribed by 260 - and 285 -mile circles to include as high a percentage of the park attendance as the more active-use parks include within thirty-mile circles. Expressed somewhat differently, eighty persons in every hundred active-use park patrons live less then fifty miles away from the park entrence, but only three persons in every hundred of the scenic-park petrons start for the perk from \& distance of less then fifty miles.
(For Table 11, see following page)

TABLE 11
IN-STAME EhK ATTENLANCES, BY DISTANCES TO INJICATED PLRCENTHEES

| Percentage of the park ettendances | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Lount* } \\ & \text { litchell } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cape** } \\ & \text { Hatteres } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Morrow*** } \\ & \text { Mountain } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hznging } \\ & \text { Rock**** } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 | 36 | - | - | 27 |
| 20 | 65 | - | - | - |
| 30 | 110 | - | - | - |
| 40 | 135 | - | - | - |
| 50 | 140 | 115 | 7 | - |
| 60 | 190 | 240 | 30 | - |
| 70 | 260 | 285 | 33 | 32 |
| 80 | 270 | 325 | 43 | 51 |
| 90 | 330 | 430 | 88 | 61 |
| 100 | 425 | 540 | 253 | 256 |

* The circles rass throngh Asheville, Taynesville, Statesville, Charlotte, Salisbury, Greensboro, Raleigh, Fayetteville, Greenville, Flizabeth City (425), respectively.
** The fifty nercent circle includes a little more than Elizabeth City, and the others pass throuzh Wilson, Raleigh, Wilmington, Statesville, A.sheville (540), respectively.
*** The fifty percent circle passes throuch Albemarle, and the others throygh Concord, Selisbury, Cherlotte, Hickory, Iurphy.
**** The ten percent circle nesses throurlifount Airy, end the others throuch Winston-Salem, Ingh Point, Greensboro, New Bern.

As e further step in the analysis of the park patronace, attention wes centered upon the area within fifty miles of the park, and a study was mide of the prk patronage as e percentege of the ectual population within trevel-distence zones located ten, twenty, thirty, forty and fifty miles from the park entrance (weble 12).

As observed in Greph 12, which shows the percentiee of the

population using each park from the respective zones of use around it，the limit of continuous locel use of active－use perks is thirty miles．Beyond this point the curve flattens out and represents partly those who are able or willing to travel longer distances for that type of recreation affordea by larger out－of－door，out－of－city幺reas，and fartly the very few vacation users who travel long dis－ tences．The graph shows clecrly that the anticipated use of a park is in direct proportion to its proximity to population concentrations thirty miles away．

TABLE 12
TOTAL FAPK ATTENDALCZS，AS FERCENTACES CF FFTE PO－ULiTICN ITTHIN CEPTATN TREVAL－LISTANCE $\angle C N F S$

| Mount | Morrow | Hanging | Fort |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Nitchell | Mountain | Rock | Nacon |

Miles


 SエO7TSTA Yエ3C
 Park visitors 0
60
0
0
0
0
0
0
1
0
0
0
$0-10 \quad 1.5$
$9.517295 .13 \quad 4.4$
5.5318

| $10-20$ | 22.9 | 18.7 | 16.1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

1.8152
8.4
$\begin{array}{lllllllll}20-30 & 89.1 & 21 & .023 & 48.5 & 309 & 0.64 & 44.7 & 102\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllllllllllllllllllllll}30-40 & 46.0 & 30.065 & 79.1 & 273 & 0.35 & 88.7 & 1911 & 10.9 & 110 & 1.0\end{array}$

＊In thousands；from 1930 Census figures．

For the above analysis ten－mile zoning was used；the meps show the more usual 15－25－50－mile zones．
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For perk-patron preficences wo are dependent upon the results of a questionnaire distributed widely at fount Nitchell, Cape Hetteres (National Seesiore) and Haneine Fock parks. The responses to this $\ddagger u e s t i o n n t i r e ~ w e r e ~ s o ~ n u m o r o u s ~ t h e t ~ w o ~ h e v e ~ i n f o r m e t i o n ~ r e-~-~$ Eurdine 13.5 percent of the rerk ettendance. One in thres out-ofStite visitors coonerrted in the study (oxect fercentare, 32), while one in svery ten residents of the St: te returned the conpleted form.

There is erreement between the returns from pr rks of similar type such es Ce pe Iatteras anc lount litchell (both of which are scenic parks), whila there is discareemont between the returns from perks differing in besic service, as exemplificd by the returns from Henging Rock, en ective-use perk, and Mount Mitchell, z. scenic park.

In the discussion of age groups, it wes pointed out that pirk patrons confirmed the ąЭ- Erovo findin€s of field checkers. In incrme and occupation of park natrons, seprictely determined, the returns confirmed eech other but did not cormoborete the State-wide ficures. This they could hardly be expected to do. In residence of paik petrons, the returas likewise departed from the Stete everages.

1. Prrkupatrons' vacatiors.

The returns indicsted the number of dny, wesk-end end regular veications taken by nark ertrons: and the averece number of niles treveled upor ecch. Then the figures were essembled $b_{j}$ income groups, the figures for doy ind for woek-ond vicetions indiceted thot if e ferily decided uron une of theso shorter vecetions, the distence triveled wuld vary with things otter th $n$ income. The digures for reg-

uler vicitions were differunt. These invari: bly involved longor miler eəs, nd the dist nece treveled veried lmost directly with income received, from :n : vimage of six hundred milen for the lowest income eroup to no.rly two thousend miles for those receivine incomes erater th: B 300 C . (The exct figures are, for the four incom eroupines: $608,708,1258 \cdot$ nd 1946 mil s, see Appendix 7).
2. lonths used for vortions.

August, July nd September :re the populrr reguler-vecetion months, in thet order. These three months were used by ninetythree pore?nt of the rerk petrons who enswored the questionneire. The spot-week fieures pleced fuccust first. The perk visitors olece August first by en overage mo:e then double that for July ind four times thet for Sopember. Such disprity between the totels for e.ch of the summer vacation inonths indicates thet the first and easiest point of atteck for ny prorem locding to : more uniform use of prok fecilitios is the efuclization of the summer months.

## 3. Annuel expenditure on vac:tions.

The ficures given by prk visitors show a detinite retio botween incoma raceived :nd amount srant unon vicetions wich dous not viry for the nerk visited. As Tiblu 13 nd Sr ph 13 show, however, the ratio is not direct. If you double f femily inccae you do not multiply by twice the mount thet will be spent upon recreetionel trevel. In other words, noorer veovle spend s lireer proportion of their income upon vec tions then do those who ere really bottor ble to cfford it. This gives e sienific'nt uniformity to the figures for : ver" $\ell$ total innuel recre.tionel exnenditure by :11
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## FARK PATRCNS' VACATIONS

AVERAGE ANNUAL EKPETDITURE, BY INCCIVE GROUPS
1938



Assisted by NPA $665-32-3-336$
park prtrons in all parks, but the hiehest-income eroup (over 3000) does spend nerrly twice es much as any other income group.

TELEE 13.


| Incorle grouns | Mount Mitchell | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cipe } \\ & \text { Hetteras } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Frnen Bock | hiverare DEr <br> incono irouy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0-31200 | \$131 | 119 | 4.6 | \#114 |
| \$1201-2000 | 146 | 151 | 127 | 141 |
| 2001-200 | 140 | 173 | 155 | 151 |
| Over 3000 | 267 | 315 | 187 | 265 |
| Avercge per park | -171 | \$190 | \$141 | \$167 |

4. Where viccitions are spent.
questionnaires distributed to pople on Zount iitchell
neturally drew replies favoring mountains as the place for recréntion. Likewise, the Ni.tional Seashore visitors preferred the sea. But Et Ieneine Rock, an nctive-use perk attrecting ell types, the vote betwe n mountains end senshore was almost $\varepsilon$. tie (l2 to 120).

Pirk petrons seem to prefer Netionsl rather then St-te perks, hut the preference rierein is smell (52 to 52) and is due entircly to the vote of the high-incume roup. Mountsins and the ser:shore, on the other hend, seem to be eiually attractive in totils bearing no rel:tion to inceme. Ocoen trips ure listed by !fow, and those who spind their vecitions abroad are distributed, fimost equeilly, mene all incone erouns but the lowest. Lekos end country $\therefore r e$ nreferred by the hiener income trouns, who live lareely in cities; but the intorest in city vecations iffocts ell incone proups fuuilly.


## 5. Preferences for recreational diversions.

The nerk patrons were allowed to express their mefurences for recreational diversions in their own words, ratier then to check items in a rrepared classificstion. This made it recescary to classify neeferences rangine from shufleboand to horseback ridine, fron bridge to notorine, but certain preferences reculved significent votos. For example: ( $\varepsilon$ ) park putrons pref:1 to swim, to travel and to fish, in thet order. Equel preferences for eports (baseball, etc.) and for hiking cone somewhat lower, and the nu:bers attrected by thesc are, in turn, double the number who core for bo\&ting, hunting, cmpine and for social eeres. with only one excertion, the recreations mentioned ?re the nreferences expressed by people drawing incomes of more then 81200 . This one exception is an apoarent lack of interest in fishing by persons recoiving an income over 3000 . The low-income proup (below 1200 ) shows an apparent lack of interest in sports (besebrll, atc.), but, for the other recreutional diversions, it her the preferences elroedy described for the hifher income grours.

Tr.e ?reference for receeatimel diversions seens, except for .. hecvy vote at hount litchell for hiking, hunting and camping, in that order, to cut across the pork netronece without rugard to the nerk for whict, the returns were made. This is abundently clear in a similarity which is curried elnost to identity between the figures for parks as dissimiler as Capu Hatteras end Haneine Rock.
6. Preferancos for recreationel travel.

With all jncome froups, and in thll nurks, the uuto is
nearly twelve times as often chosen for recreational travel as a train, fifteen times as often as a boc.t, and twenty-two tines as often as a bus. The questionnaire listed both auto and bus, so the גisparity between the two votes represents, not confusion between auto and bus in the minds of the answerers, but a surprisine preference for the cutomobile. This is perheps not surprising in itself, but thet twice as meny people should orefer \& train ride to a bus ride as a recreational diversion is interesting.

## 7. Preferences in securing food.

Perk patrons solve the problem of securing food first by going to a restaurent. They do this necrly twice as often as they go to a hotel and three times as of ten as they cook their own meal or eat lunches which they have brought with ther. Fewest of sill eat at private homes, but the number is large enough to be significint. In the matter of securing food, an income pettern cen be seen, but, no matter what one's incone, carrying lunches is equelly popular. The same equelity is seen in the number who eut et privete homes and who cook et cemp stoves. In fact, the letter is more popular than the former with those receiving incomes greater then \$1200. (The income pattern - a direct reletion between income and eqting habits - is most clearly shown in the figures for restourants and hotels. The lurger the income, the more often these methods of securirg food are chosen.) The usual proportion is one of two eaters in restaurats to one in hotels, and this ratio persists until the highest income group is resched, when the percentafe of those who eat in hotels rises.


## 8. Preferences for means of lodging.

Park patrons prefer to lodge in hotels. Tourist homes come next, and toutist camps third. This takes care of nine out of every ten of the park patrons. The remaining one in every ten uses roadside camps, tents, and euto or trailer, in that order. In only one park (i:ount IVitchell) do tourist camps draw more than tourist homes, and this is true for all income groups at this park. For the other parks, hotels, tourist homos ard tourist cemps are preferred, in that order, by all income groups. Only for hotels is there en income pattern. In the lowest income group, hotels, tourist homes and tourist camps have equal attraction, but the percentage of hotel-users rises with increased income, and in the highest income group there are more then twice as many people in hotels as there are in tourist camps or tourist homes.

MORE DETAILED ANALYSIS CF PATK ATT NDANCE, BY FARKS.
Before discussing perk attendance by parks, attention should be called to the distinction already made (page 3) between the different kinà of parks: (1) the active-use parks, such as Hancing Rock and Norrow Hountain, and (2) scenic perks such as Cape Hatteras and iount ifitchell. In almost everything, the respective park patrons differ: number attending on Sunday; distribution of week-duy attendence; time of errival at perk; deoendence upon weather; percentace of children; percentage of urban, rural nonferm enc rursl-firm visitors; percentage of high-income receivers; Dercentage of professionsil nd technical workers; percente:ge of out-

of-State visitors. These facts will have become abundantly clear from the tables and graphs which have already been presented, and to which reference c an be made for details of the individual parks.

1. Mount lifitchell.

The total number of visitors recorded at Mount Mitchell was 1526. These figures were not for one spot-week per month, as in the case of the other parks, but for three weeks in the late summer (see Table l), and it would have been difficult to compute a seasonal total if there had been no previous records for this park. (See Appendix 2 for the way in which the estimate was made). The total summer attendance is estimated to be 7,460 .

The total checked attendance, 1526 , represents the combined attendance at the two checking stations: (a) Camp Alice, and (b) the "parking area", two miles farther on and wi, inin a few hundred yards of the summit, less the number (170) who were counted twice, once by each checker. The second checker recorded also the number seen on the trail to the summit. This number; 1089 , is larger than the attendance recorded at the "parking area", end the difference, 546 , represents the number who elected to make the one-mile climb rather then pay an additional twenty-five cent toll. The number reaching the sumriit of Mount Mitchell (1089) is 71.4 percent of the number entering the park.

The total nark attendance, 1526 , was checked under conditions which make it difficult to speak of 1938 in terms of distribution of attendance over the summer. Records for 1930-1935 show a very uniform rise to a peak in August followed by a sudden drop, in

September, but even October had more visitors then licy (Tcble 14).

MAELE 14
ATTENDANCE AT MCUNT IUTCEIELL STATI FAFK, 1030, 1931, 1933, 1934, 1935 (IN PART), BY LINAIH

|  | IN-STAME | OUT-OF-STATE | TOTAL |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| April | 29 | 67 | 96 |
| Iicy | 295 | 397 | 692 |
| June | 1718 | 3085 | 4803 |
| Tuly | 3654 | 5960 | 9614 |
| August | 3336 | 6678 | 10014 |
| September | 1147 | 1861 | 3008 |
| October | 413 | 676 | 1099 |
| November | 67 | 115 | 182 |
| Total | 10659 | 18840 | 29499 |

The three check-week figures show thsit, for deys of week, Mount Fitchell has the fairly even attendince distribution characteristic of the other scenic perk--Cape Hatteras. There the Sunday attendence was thirteen percent lurger than thet of the next heoviest day; at Nount Nitchell it is twenty-one. The five-yeur records for 1030-1935 give a total Sunday ettendence which is twenty percent greater then that of the next heaviest day. The difference betwoen twenty and twenty-one nercent is so slight thict in still another instrnce the check-week method has proven its dependability.

The longer five-year record is broken down in Graph 15 into in-Stete and out-of-Sti:te. Here two different pitterns apper.r,
(anchen
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one for in-Stste and another for out-of-State visitors. The inState visitors are quite evenly distributed over the early week drys, rise on Saturday and continue to a Sunday peak which is nerirly double the esrly week-day cverage. The out-of-State visitors rise to and fall from a !ednesdey maxiraum and then reech average figures, for Seturduy and Sundry, which barely exceed the in-Stite Sund"y totrl (Teble 15 and Gruph 15). Table 16 and Giepll 16 give the record by years.

TABLT 15.
AT:ENDANCT AT MOTNT 1935 (IN FATT) , BI DAY (F VEEK

|  | IN-ST ${ }^{\text {me }}$ | OUT-OF-STME | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| l.ondey | 1423 | 2408 | 3821 |
| Tuesdicy | 1117 | 2849 | 3966 |
| Wednesday | 1432 | 3213 | 4645 |
| Thursdey | 1175 | 2610 | 3785 |
| Friday | 1062 | 2172 | 3234 |
| Saturde y | 1677 | 2787 | 4464 |
| Sunday | 2773 | 2,01 | 5574 |
| Totel | 10559 | 18840 | 29499 |

The total checked attendince for 1938, 1526, (a) reuched the park in the afternoon tivice as often as it did in the morning, but this was lareely the result of accessibility, one-way-trafficrule hours, etc.; (b) was divided into over-eighteen end under-eight-een-yerr-olds in the ratio of five and $s$ hinf to one; (c) included

ATTENDANCE MOUNT MITCHELL STATE PARK BY DAY OF WEEK
1930, 1931, 1933, 1934, 1935(in part)


three and $\varepsilon$ h:lf tires as many city-dwellers, one-third as msny rural non-ferm people and one-seventh as meny firmers os one wauld

TABLE 16.
ATTEMDACE AT MOUNT MITCHELL STATE FAIK, 1930, 1931, 1933, 1934, BY YEAIR

| IEAR | MT-STATE | CUT-CF-STATE | TCF. L |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1930 | 3338 | 5851 | 9189 |
| 1931 | 29,61 | 5812 | 8773 |
| 1933 | 1421 | 2021 | 3442 |
| 1934 | 1842 | 3244 | 5086 |
| TOTAL | 9562 | 16928 | 26490 |

expect solely from their number in the Stite; (d) included elmost four times as many people with high incomes as ere indiceted by the Stite-wide averages; (e) was made up of in-State and out-ofState people in the unvsuel, even for scenic parks, ratio of four to five; (f) raceived from the neighboring Stutes of Tennessee, South Caroline : nd Virginie one-third of its out-of-State visitors; (g) required o travel-distence of 260 miles to secure seventy percent of its summer ettendence*; (h) derived only one person in every thirty-five of its attendence from a distence of less then fifty miles; (i) includel, during the entire summer, only one person in every nine hundred living within fifty miles of the park

[^3](ancen

ATTENDANCE, MOUNT IITCHELL STATE PARK, BY YEAR 1930, 1931, 1933, 1934

entrance; zind (j) included, on an averege Sundny, only one person in every seven thousand of those living within the fifty-mile zone. 2. Cape He.tterus.

The total number of visitors recorded at C ipe IIatteris was 1498 , end the estimated total for the summer season of 10,38 is 5400. The figures do not include 3776 individuels who are not classed es purk visitors, numely: (1) people, largely C.C.C. workers, triveling in Government vehicles, 2161; (2) people troveling in unljcensed locel cars, 1594; and (3) locel pedestrians, 21. The totail ittendince, 1493 , (a) was so spread over the sumer months that the maximun week was only half agein as lirge us the minimum week (rctual figures 330 and 215); (b) was sprend evenly through the entire week, the Sundey rttendance being only thirteen percent grociter thrn that of the next heaviest d:y; (c) cume most largely, as is ususl, during the ufternoon hours; (d) was uneffected by the weather conditions; (e) was divided into over-eighteen and undur-eighteen-year-olds in the ratio of four to one, which should be compared with a Netional Seashore ratio of six to one and a Stetewide ratio of one to one (actual figures 54 to 46 ); (f) included over three tinies as meny city-dweliers, one-helf as meny rural nonferm people, and one-twelfth es meny fermers as one would expect sololy from their number in the Stre; (g) included four times es meny people with high incomes as there are in the Sti.te-wide avereges; (h) was made up of in-Strte and out-of-Stcte people in the ratio of three nd $\varepsilon$ holf to one; (i) had en out-of-Stete attendence
(2)
which was made up of one person from neighboring Virgiric to two from ell other Str.tes; (j) derived none of its visitors from less then 115 miles 0 ows, due to its position upon : barriter becch, and required it trivel-distance of 285 miles to secure seventy percent of its totel ettendence; and (k) represented 4.7 jercent of the total number of visitors to the Nationel Se shore, of imich Cex Hetteres Stite Furk is itself $₹$ prot.

Speckine in terms of crs, which, because of their license numbers, cen be individuelly treced, 599 cers turned toviard Cepe Hattercs from the Nationgl Sesshore at Thalebone stition. One hundred and five of thase crossad the intervenine Oragon Inlet ferry, but only forty-ninu of these reeched Cape Hetter.s. In other worids, of the 332 cers reported ris arriving at Cepe Fictter:s, forty-nine begen the triv it Whalebone stetion. An addition:l sighteen joined these by st. rting et Oreॄon Inlet find continuing on to the Cripe itself, le:ving. 265 cirs to be otherrise eapli.ined,
3. Norrow Mount-in.

The number of visiturs recorded : t lorrow Nount in during the summer of 1938 wis 3182 . This nuruber fell short of representing even the total for the chockad wee's beccuse two Sundeys end three weok doys were onitted. As expl-ined in Appendix 3, the nocesscry interpoletions werc mede and : n astimeted totrl of 21700 for the summer serson wrs secured. (This number will be surprssed when the orrk is offici, lly opened, see piees 7 nd 8).

The totill checked ettendence, 3182 , (a) w.s somewh t unevonly distributed over the sumer months, rising to c. maximum woek distributed over the week as the other tuctive-use nark (Hanging Roc the Sundry sverige being only four times the Scturd. $y$ average ind nine times the week-d:y :verged; (c) come almost equally during the morning ind afternoon, nd bed $n$, (d) whee divided into over-eighteen less then half es lures as either; (a) was : nd under-eighteen-yeur-olds in the $r$ in the ratio of nineteen to made up of in-Strte $n$ nd out-of-St: te ne one; ( $f$ ) derived only one-fifth of its out $(g)$ derived seventy perfrom the St-tes imuedi-tely north and south; ( $g$ ) derived seventy par cent of lis prim attendance from within thirty-three miles of the rook entrance; (h) included eleven people out of every hundred ivduplications, and four people out As hes been said, these figures ire for $:$ n. Pk which has not yet been officially opened.

## 4. Hen 2 ing rock.

The total number of visitors recorded fit H: nging Rock during the summer of $193^{8}$ wis 3163, nd the estimated total for the summer so: son is 22,650 . (As clrefdy stated, pries seven ind eight, this is = minimum which will be greatly surpassed when the prim is officirlly opened). The total check de.ttendence, $3163,(a)$ was somewhat $t$ unevenly distributed because of n e conormelly high Mary fig-

ure, but, for the summer months, the meximum wook whs less thin three times es l-rge z.s the minimum week (fcturl fieuros 768 end 280); (b) wes so unevenly distributed through the woeks that the avergee Sundiy hi:d twonty times the nver fe s: turdry itt nd ne end forty-five times that of the $i v \in r=$ woskdey; (c) cemi most numerously in the morning -nd hid on evening ittendincu one-third thet of the morming, both tha result of accessibility; (d) wos grustly affected by the wenther conditions, the cleir-d-y everfee being fifteen times thet for r:iny drys; (e) was divided into over-eightwen :nd under-aight-een-yurr-olds in the retio of two ind $r$ helf to one, the highest porcentege of children in fyy prrk, end one in which field checker end perk petron éch confirm the other; (f) included two nd : hrlf times is meny city divellers, fewer rursl non-ferm, ind one-fourth e.s meny firmers es one would expect solely from their numbers in the St-te; (g) included four times es mrny peoplo with high incomes is would be indic: ted by the Strte-widu rver: ges; (h) wis mide up of in-Strte end out-of-St te deople in the r:tio of thirty to one; (i) received from the nenrby St-ts of Virgini- one-helf of its out-ofSt: to totel of 104; (j) derivid sevonty pu-cont of its ttendence from within thirty-two riles of the rerk; (k) included betwen two snd three poople of every hundred living :ithin fifty miles of the parik; end (l) on en "vure sund•y, included one person in every six hundred of those living within the fifty-mile zone.

## 5. Fort Macon.

Fort Macon is the only park for which we h: ve attendince figures covering the entire yes. The totil :ttendence, 13,491 , is shown by months in Teble 17 ind Greph 17 , which show a sherp rise to July :nd August hiehs of nerrly three thcusend erch, end en even sherper decline to mid-winter ficures approchine one hundred. The weekly figures do not rise ind fill quite so uniformly, but for the months of April, Mry, June, August end September there is only one week whose totrl would not heve Efforded n correct spot-week indication, if that method had been used to determine the attend:nce.

TABLE 17.
FORT :IACCN, ATTEMD.NCE, 1938 , BY I ONTH

| MCNTH | IN-STATE | OUT~OF-STATE | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jenuciry | 256 | 104 | 360 |
| Februstry | 434 | 179 | 613 |
| March | 609 | 187 | 795 |
| April | 1207 | 295 | 1502 |
| Rey | 694 | 146 | 840 |
| June | 1576 | 294 | 1870 |
| July | 2601 | 418 | 3019 |
| August | 2474 | 421 | 2805 |
| September | 742 | 156 | 898 |
| October | 346 | 59 | 405 |
| November | 169 | 32 | 201 |
| December | 63 | 29 | 92 |
| Tot 1 | 11171 | 2320 | 13491 |
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During July there wos enough fluctuation so thet spot-week checks would he shown little more then lerge ittendence ind would not have indicated thet the second week in August would be the high week of the yeir.

The fort was closed durine 1933:nd 1934, but the totil figures for 1930-1932 and 1935-1038 are combined by month in Tible 18, by duy of week in Teble 19 shd by yesrs in Teble 20.

Tsble 18 links Fort Rccon witt sll other perks by showing theit August is the peck month. The rise to Auguat from the J: nuery low would be a smooth curve if it were not for June figures which show en unexplcined tendency to $r \in m$ in et or near the liey level. From the August perk, the decrense to the winter lows is feirly abrupt. Both in-St-te and out-of-Strte figures show the scme general curve for the yecr, but the percentrge of out-of-St, te prak petrons is grentest during the winter months. In Jrnurry it is thirty five, in August it is only sixteen.


TABLE 18.
FORT IACCN, ATTENLANCE BY GONNH
1930-1932, 1935-1938
In-State (In-St.) and out-of State (out-St.)

|  | 1930-1932* | 1935 | 1936 | 1937 | 1838 | Fotal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | In- Out- <br> St. St. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In- Out- } \\ & \text { St. St. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { In- Out- } \\ \text { St. } & \text { St. } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In- Out- } \\ & \text { St. St. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { In- Out- } \\ \text { St: } & \text { St. } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { In- Cut- } \\ \text { St. } & \text { St. } \end{array}$ |
| Jen. |  |  |  | 14935 | 256104 | 405139 |
| Feb. |  |  |  | 4448 | 434179 | $478 \quad 227$ |
| Mar. |  |  | 27232 | $412 \quad 89$ | 609187 | 1293308 |
| Apr. |  |  | $717 \quad 86$ | 731153 | 1207295 | 2655534 |
| N:y |  |  | 1926335 | $1080 \quad 237$ | 694146 | 369718 |
| June | 34245 |  | 1463378 | 47570 | 1576294 | $3856 \quad 787$ |
| July | 1380,171 | 1425243 | 3668775 | 835210 | 2601418 | 90181817 |
| Aug. | 1497219 | $3582 \quad 549$ | $4160 \quad 624$ | 508140 | 2474421 | 122211953 |
| Sep. | 770184 | 1515261 | 1650, 332 | 1294373 | $742 \quad 156$ | 59801306 |
| Oct. |  | $958 \quad 244$ | 516126 | 717212 | 34659 | 2537641 |
| Nov. |  | $848 \quad 259$ | 387130 | 540151 | 16932 | 1944572 |
| Dec. |  | 15930 | 21172 | 27485 | $63 \quad 29$ | 707216 |
| To- <br> trils | 3908619 | 84871586 | 149792890 | $70591803$ | $111712320$ | $456949218$ |
| To- <br> tal | 4617 | 10073 | 17869 | 8862 | 13,491 | 54,912 |

* The fort was closed in 1933 and 1934.

By day of week, Fort Macon's record more nearly resembles that of active-use rather than the scenic parks. Consistantly through the years, there have been more Sundey visitors, by twice, then all other week-day visitors combined; and this hes been true of both in-State and out-of-Sticte pitrons (sce Teble 19).
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TABLE 19.
FOFT N:ACCN, A'TENDANCE BY DAY CF VEEK
1,330-1932; 1935-19,38
In-State (In-St.) and Out-of-State (Out-St.)

| 1930-1932 | 1935 | 1936 | 1937 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { In- Out } \\ & \text { St. } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Out St. | Ou St | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{Ou} \\ -\quad \mathrm{St} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Out } \\ & \text { St. } \end{aligned}$ |

rion. $\begin{array}{lllllllllllll}368 & 36 & 448 & 135 & 564 & 189 & 452 & 158 & 738 & 193 & 2570 & 711\end{array}$
Tue. $\begin{array}{llllllllllll}145 & 68 & 539 & 122 & 990 & 233 & 400 & 180 & 872 & 198 & 3316 & 729\end{array}$
wed. $\quad 459 \quad 74 \quad 690 \quad 134 \quad 1148 \quad 262 \quad 451 \quad 136$
Thu. $431 \quad 54 \quad 1064 \quad 218 \quad 1348 \quad 293 \quad 481 \quad 136$
Fri. $\begin{array}{llllllllllllll}585 & 63 & 699 & 150 & 1680 & 268 & 421 & 236 & 908 & 257 & 4293 & 974\end{array}$

Sun. $\begin{array}{llllllllllllllll}1237 & 205 & 4374 & 686 & 7523 & 1374 & 4071 & 838 & 5395 & 934 & 22600 & 4036\end{array}$
To-
tals $3998619 \quad 8487158614979$ 2890 70591803111712320456949218 TC-
TAI . $4617 \quad 10073 \quad 17869 \quad 8862 \quad 13491 \quad 54912$

Beginning its active career as a scenic-historic State park in 1930, Fort Hacon attracted fourteen hundred end fifty people the first year, twelve nercent of the number coming from other States. The number attending the fort increascd to 2651 in 1931 , but dropped to 516 in 1932, and the fort was closed for the next two yeers. Reopening in 1935, it attracted more than ten thousend visitors, reached a banner year of nearly eighteen thousand in 1936, and attracted 13,500 in 1938 after dropping to less then nine thousand in 1937, when, for most of the summer, the entrance road was closed. The total number of visitors to Fort Nacon between June, 1930, and

(anchen

December, 1938, was 54,912 (see Table 20).

TABLE 20.
FORT LIACON,ATTENDANCE BY YEAPS
1930-1932,* 1935-1938

| YEAR | IN-STATE | CUT-OF-STATE | TOTAL |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1930 | 1275 | 175 | 1450 |
| 1931 | 2260 | 391 | 2651 |
| 1932 | 463 | 53 | 516 |
| 1935 | 8487 | 1586 | 10073 |
| 1936 | 14979 | 2890 | 17869 |
| 1937 | 7059 | 1803 | 8862 |
| 1938 | 11171 | 2320 | 13491 |
| Total | 45694 | 9218 | 54912 |

* Fort Macon was closed to the public in 1933 and 1934.
为
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## APFENDIX 1

## The accuracy of summer totals estimated from spot-week

checkings.- The total attendance figures were obtained by multiplying the five-week checked totals by four, in the case of all parks but Morrow Mountain and Mount liitchell (see Appendices 2 and 3).

The validity of the multiplication by four, in spite of the fact that there are not exactly four weeks a month, but a total of twenty-two weeks during the months from l"ay to September, inclusive, was checked in different ways.

First, by comparing (a) the total secured for Fort Macon by the times-four method with (b) the actual attendance. The two totals differed by only 745 in 12,537 , or six percent.

Second, by drawing attendance curves and interpolating for the unchecked weeks. This was done for all of the parks and the totals secured in this way varied by only seven percent from the totals obtained by the times-four method. As a still further check, the interpolating curve method was used for Old Fort Raleigh, a checking station in the National Seashore which recorded more then 100,000 individuals, and was therefore large enough satisfactorily to check the accuracy of the method. There the two methods gave totals which agreed within five percent,

One week ner month figures are believed to give valid indications of the sumer trend and of the totals themselves, and in this report, the figures for single weaks are cited as average figures for the month. Similar methods are used in the Gallup Poll, which forecasted the last election to within one percent. They are
?:sed by the crop forecasters who trevel across States in cers equipped with buttons which enable the observer to push in the button for a particular crop while he is driving pest that crop and to emerge at the State boundary with dependable averages for all the crops. The smoothness of the curves, the persistence of particular averages, irrescective of observer, diy and location; the macnitude of the figures secured, - till these make dependable the figures that heve been used in the analysis.

## APPENDIX 2

How the totol estimated summer attendance was computed
for Mount Mitchell.- For Mount Mitchell, the only records $\varepsilon$ veilable were for two weeks in late fugust and one week in eqrly September. To use such figures as avercees for a season extending from IEy to September would violite all principles of obtaining averages, su another method wis used. Attrendance ficures for the sume three weeks over a five-year geriod (10,30-1935) were compared with the totul attendance for those five yeers and a relationship established. This showed that the total summer attendance for each of the five years was 4.89 times the attendance for the three weeks in question. Multiplying 1526 , the 1938 three-week c.ttendance, by this factor gives a total of 7,460 for the Mount litchell summer total. If the three-weeks' fiॄures hod been spread uniformly over the summer the total would heve been 10,000 . The total of 7,460 is believed to be much more nerrly correct, and it is used in the tables.

## APPENDIX 3

## How the total summer attendance at Norrow Mountain was

computed.- For Morrow Mountain, no May records were available, and there were no records for the Sundays of June and September, nor for June 12, 13 and 14. For the June and September omissions, graphic comparison was made with the summer trend at Henging Rock and the necessary interpolations made. Estimates of 1250 for June and 626 for September resulted. Comparison with the Miy figures for Hanging Rock was useless because of the presence there of an unusually lerge Nicy Sunday. An extension, into May, of the summer average of 1085 was therefore essumed. The total was computed by multiplying the estimated summer totals by four, as explained in Appendix l. Morrow Mountain has an estimated total summer attendance of 21,700 people.

## APPENDIX 4

NU EIR OF FEFSCNS, CARS, AND PERSONS PER: CAR
ATTENDING NORTH CAROLINA PfRKS - 1938

|  | National Seashore | Cape Hatteras |  | Henging Rock |  | lorrow Rountain |  | Mount Mitchell |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. \% | No. | \% | No. | 8 | No. | $\cdots$ | No. | \% |
| Attendance: |  | **** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| In-State | 2231469.9 | 1165 | 77.9 | 3059 | 96.7 | 3363 | 35. |  | 44.5 |
| Out-State | 959330.1 | 333 | 22.1 | 104 | 3.3 | 177 | 5. |  | 55.5 |
| Total | 31907100 | 1.498 | 100 | 3163 | 100 | 3540 | 100 | 1189 | 100 |
| Cars: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| In-State | 680170.1 | 332 | 77.6 | 693 | 96.5 |  | 95.6 | 139 | 41.5 |
| Out-State | 289629.9 | 96 | 22.4 | 25 | 3.5 | 43 | 4.4 |  | 58.5 |
| Total | 9697100 | 428 | 100 |  |  |  |  | 335 |  |
| Persons Per Car: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| In-State | 3.3 | 3.5 |  | 4.4 |  | 3.6 |  | 3.8 |  |
| Out-State | 3.3 | 3.5 |  | 4.2 |  | 4.1 |  | 3.4 |  |
| Total, Average | 3.3 | 3.5 |  | $4 \cdot 3$ |  | 3.9 |  | 3.6 |  |
| Persons in |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Govt. Cers* | 1324 | 2161 |  | 2 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| Person in N.C. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Persons in Cars of unknown origin.*** | 1776 | 78 |  | 206 |  | 135 |  | 337 |  |
| * Not included in the figures tabulated above. <br> ** Included in In-State figures. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *** Included in In-Stcte figures for every perk but Mount Mitchell. For the other parks "unknown" me ...t an unknown locetion within the State; for liount Mitchell, even the State wes unknown. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **** Not counti | ng unlicens | d cars |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## APPEINDIX 5

PARK ATTENDANCE, BY AGE GROUPS: CHECKERS' RECORDS AND FATRCNS' STATE SINS - 1938.

| Checkers ' records |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Under Park patrons' | Stictonents |  |  |
| Under |  |  |  |
| Total 18 | $\%$ | Total | 18 |

Mount liitchell, Totcls:

| Parking Area | 543 | 104 | 19.2 | 272 | 81 | 29.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Comp flice | 983 | 138 | 14.0 |  |  |  |

Nount Mitcheil, those counted twice:*
Parking Areu
Crmp Alice
$165 \quad 32 \quad 19.4$
$\begin{array}{llll}160 & 19 & 11.3\end{array}$
Cape Hatteras
$1498301 \quad 20.2 \quad 265$
$59 \quad 22.3$
Henging Rock
$\begin{array}{llll}3163 & 889 & 28.1 & 262\end{array}$
$74 \quad 28.2$

* These are the same people, seen first in cers at Cump Alice by the checker there and seen in the some cars by the checker at the Parking Area. At Cimp Alice the percentage of children was recorded as 19; at the perking Aree, as 11.


## APPENDIX 6.

park attendance, by age groues, by ncinths,*1938, BY FERCENTACES

|  | Neitional Seashore Under 18 Over 18 |  | RorrowIiount:ainUnder 18 Over 10 |  | Hane Rock <br> Under 18 | $\text { Over } 18$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hay | - | - | - | - | 20 | So |
| June | 15.3 | 84.7 | 22.7 | 77.3 | 26.8 | 73.2 |
| July | 13.7 | 86.3 | 18.8 | 81.2 | 43.6 | 56.4 |
| August | 14.2 | 85.8 | 21.4 | 78.6 | 28.7 | 71.3 |
| September | 15.8 | 84.2 | 2.9 | 97.1 | 18.2 | 81.8 |
| November | 13.3 | 86.7 | 16.2 | 83.8 | - | - |
| Average | 14.3 | 85.7 | 19.2 | 80.8 | 28.1 | 71.9 |

* Mount Mitchell is absent from the table because period checked covers three weeks in le.te August and ecrly September only.

See the accompanying graph (NO. 21) where the effect of the summer closing of the schools is lether strikingly shown. In the National Seashore, the summer closing has no effect; in the rctive-use parks (Morrow lountain end Henging Rock) there is in effect, even though it expresses itseif difierently. At Morrow dountain it is seen in an ebrupt drop $\rightarrow$ the attendance of children in September, at Hunging Rock in a definite incresse during the surmer months.


## PERCEITTAGE OF

PARK VISITCTS UNDER EICHT TEN YEARS OF AGE BY MCNTHES 1938
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APPENSIX 7
PADK PATRONS' VACATICNS.
Averafe number and averace distance traveled, by income groups

| Income | Dey vacations |  | Week-end vacations |  | Reguler | vacations |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Average Number | Averace Distance | Average Number | Average Distance | Average Number | $\begin{gathered} \text { Averqge } \\ \text { Distance } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 0-- | 10.1 | 326 | 6.3 | 282 | 1.6 | 603 |
| \$1201-\$2000 | 12.4 | 143 | 8.0 | 204 | 1.2 | 708 |
| \$2001- ${ }^{\text {\% }} 3000$ | 9.5 | 153 | 7.1 | 210 | 1.7 | 1258 |
| Over \$3000 | 10.9 | 268 | 10.1 | 302 | 2.0 | 1946 |
| Totels | 10.2 | 22? | 7.9 | 250 | 1.6 | 1130 |
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Note. -Underlined page numbers refer to pages on which tables occur, eraphs are preceded by "G", and, in the report, these graphs immediately follow the page containing the table.
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Fooc, where and inw secured by park patrons 29
Fort Nacon Cti.te Iark 39-43, G17, G18, Gl9, G20
--.., attendence, $\mathrm{J}_{\mathrm{y}}$ check-weeks, 1938 8, Gl
--- -- by day $0:$ week, 1938 11, $G 3$
--- --- by duy of week. 7-year period 42, Gl9
--- --- bJ month 1938 39, Gl7
--- --- by montn 7 -year period 4 I , Gl 8
--- ---., checked total. 1938 o
--- ---, estimatid sumruer total, 19389
--- ---, in-Stete and out-of-Stiate, 1938 19, G9
--- ---, in-State and out-of-sti.te, by yerrs 43, G20
---, history of its use as a Siete Park 42
...-, in detail 32-43, G17, GlE, G19, G20
Future development $\frac{13}{6}$, 11-12
Gruph 1. Purk at endance for 1038 , by check-weoks 8-9
--- 2. (There is no grañh by this number.)
--- 3. Daily attendances as percentages of the total weekly attendances, 1938 11-12
--- 4, Perk atterdances, by period uf day, 1938 13-14
--- 5. Average attendance per day; iased upon weather cond-tions, week dajs ..nly, 1938 14-15
--- 6. Paria attendance, by age groujs, $10 ; 38$ 15-16
--- 7. Park attencance; by residence, as given in park fatrons' statemenさこ, 1938 16-17
--- 8. Perk attendance by income gioups, in-Stcite, from park petrons' statements, 1938 18-19
--- 9. Park attendance, in-State an' out-of-State, by purcentages, 1938 i"-20
--- 10. Out-of.-State par: oftrons, in ighboring and dist-u.t, $1 c_{j}^{-} 8$ 21-22
--- ll. (There is no griph by this number.)
--- 12. Total pajk atteicances, as percentiages of the popu:.ation within certain travel-distance zone: 1939 24-25
--- 13. Park patr rs' vacations, average annual expenditure, by i:come gioups, 1938 27-28
--- 14. Attendanc at Ncunt l'itchell Strte Park, 1930, 1931, 1933. 1934, 1935 (in purt), by month 32-33
--- 15. Attendanc: at Mount Mitchell State Park, 1930, 1931, 1933, 1934, 1935 (in port), by day of week 33-34

Graph 16. Attendance at Mount Nitchell State Park, 1930, 1931, 1933, 1934, by year 34-35
--- 17. Fort Macon, attendance, 1938, by month 39-40
--- 18i Fort Nacon, attendance by month, 1930-1932, 1935-1938 41-42
--- 19. Fort Macon, Ettendance by day of week, 1930-1032, 1935-1938 42-43
--- 20. Fort ilacon, attendance by y $\in a r s, 1930-1932$, 1.935-1038 $\quad 43-44$
--- 21. Ferceniage of park visitors under 18 yeurs of age, by months, 1938 50-51
Hanging :lock State Park, 1938 37-38
--.- attendance and weather 14, G5
--- ---, by are groups 15, G6
-.- --- by check-weeks 8, Gl
--- --- by day of week In, G3
--- --- by income groups among park patrons 16,18 , 68
--- --- by occupation of park patrons 17
--- --- by period of dey 13, G4
--- -- by residence of park patrons 15,16 , 77
--- ---, checked tctal $\dot{j}$
--- ---, estimsted surmer total $q$
--- --- from neigeboring and dictant States 21, G10
.... .-., in-State and out-of-State 19, 48, G9
--- --- will increase 7, 8
---, cars entering, in-Stete and out-of-State 48
---, children attending 14, 15, G6
--- --- by months 50, G21
--- ---, checkers: rec cords and pari metrons' figures 49
--- in detail $37-38$
---, persons in cars of unknown oricin 48
--- --- in Government cars 48
--- --- in North Carolina trucks 48
--- --- per car 48
---, rurci-farn patrons $15,16, ~ 67$
---, rural non-ferm petions $\overline{15}, \underline{16}, G 7$
---, urban petrons 15, 16, G7
Heat, effect of, upon at endance 12
Holidays 9
Income groups in North Sarolinu $\frac{18}{88}$, G8
Incomes of park patrons $16,18, \overline{G 8}$
Introduction 1
Lodging, where secured oy park patrons 30
Nount Kitchell State Park 31-35, G14, G15, G16
---, attendance, by ace groups 1938 15, G6
--- --- by check-weeks, 1938 8, G1
--- --- by dey of week, 10,38 피, G3
-.. -.. by dey of week, 5-yecr period 33, Gl5
--- --- by incorue groups among park patrons, 1938 16, 18, 68
--- --- by months, 5-year period 32, G14

Mount Mitchell Stste Park--continued
--- --- by occupation of park patrons, 193817
--- .-- by period of day, 1938 13, G4
--- --- by residence of park patrons, 1938 15, 16, G7
--- ---, checked total, 19382
-.- ---, estimated sumner total, 19382
--- --- from neighboring and distant States, 1038 21, Gl0
--- ---, in-Stute and out-of-State, 1938 19, 48 , c-9,
--- ---, in-State and out-of-State, by years 34, G16
---, cars entering, in-State and out-of-State 48
---, children attending 14, 15, G6
--- --- by months 50, G21
-.- -..., checkers' records and park patrons' figures 49
---, commutation of 1838 summer attendance 46
---, in detail 31-35, Gl4, G15, Gl6
-..., in-State and out-of-State attendance over 5-year period 10, 34, Gl6
---, percentage reaching summit of mountain 31
---, persons in cars of unknown origin, 193848
--- --- in Government cars, 193848
-.- -- in North Carolina trucks, 193848
--- -- per car 48
---, rural-farm patrons $15,16, G 7$
---, rural non-famm patrons $15,16, G 7$
---, urban patrons 15,16, G7
Morrow Mountain State Park, 1938 36-37
---, attendance, by age groups 15 , 66
--- --- by check-weeks, 1038 8, G1
-.- --- by day of week, 1938 I1, G3
--- --- by period of day $13, \overline{\mathrm{G4}}$
--- ---, checked total, 19389
--- --, estimated summer total, 19382
--- --- from neighboring and distant Sta.tes 2l, GlO
-.. -..-, in-State and out-of-State 19, 48, G9
--- --- will increase $7,8,10$
---, cars entering, in-State cind out-of-State 48
---, children attending 14, 15, G6
---, computation of 1930 summer atterdance 47
--- in detail 36-37
--- persons in cars of rnknown origil 48
-.- --- in Government cirs 48
--- --- in North Carolize trucks 48
--- --- per car 48
National Seashore
---, attendance, in State and out-of-State 48
-.-, cars entering, in-Siate and out-of-State 48
---, children attending, by months 50, G21
---, persons in curs of unknown origin 48
--- -. in Government cars 48
--- --- in North Cerolina trucks 48
--- --- per car 48

North Carolina
---, attendance, as percentage of population 20
--- ---, compared with out-of-State 18, 19, G9
---, children in 15 , G6
---, income groups in 18, 68
---, parks studied 6
---, perk-use season 4
---, rural ferm residents in 15 , G6
---, rural non-farm residents in 15 , G6
---, urban residents in 15 , G6
Occupations of purk patrons 17
Park patrons
---, food, where and how secured 29
---, lodging, where secured 30
---, preferences 25-30
---, questionnaire 25
--- --- corroborates checkers 25
--- ---, distribution of 25
--- ---, response 25
---, recreational diversions of 28
---, recreational travel of 28
---, vacetion expenditures 26,27, G13
--- --- mileage, by income groups 51
--- --- months 26
---, vacations 25
--- ---, where spent 27
Parks, accessibility to in-State and out-of-State patrons 20
---, number visited in one year by average patron 20
Park-use season
Questionnaire 25
--- corroborates checkeis 25
---, distribution of 25
---, response 25
Rucreational diversions of park patrons 28
--- travel of park patrons 28
Scenic Perks defined 3: 6, 10, 30
---, attendance summarized 5
---, occupations represerted 17
---, questionnaire returns from 25
---, travel-distance miles to percentapes of attendince 22,23
Spot-weeks, accurecy of summer totals estirated from 44
--- at all parks but Cave Hatteras run from Sunday through Saturday 11
--- at Cape Hatteras ruil from Nionday through Sunday 11
---, figures for, can be used as monthly totals when multiplied by four 39, 44.
Summary of findings 3
Table 1. Park Attendances for 1938 , by check-weeks 8
--- 2. Total purk attendance figures, 1938, with estimated total seasonal figures 9
--- 3. Park attendances, actual and by percentages, by day of week, 193811
-
Table 4. Park attendance, by period of dey, 193813
--- 5. Average attendance per doy, based upon weather conditions, weekdays only, 193814
--- 6. Park attendance, by age groups, 193815
--- 7. Park attendance, by residence, as given in park patrons' statements 16
--- 8. Park attendance, by income groups, in-State, from park patrons' statements 18
--- S. Perk attendance, in-State and out-of-State, by percentages 19
--- 10. Out-of-State park patrons, neighboring and distant 21
--- 11 In-State park attendance, by distance to indicated percentages 23
--- 12. Total park attendances, as percentages of the population within certain travel-distance zonos 24
--- 13. Park patrons' vacations, average annual expenditure, by income groups 27
--- 14. Attendance et Mount Mitchell Stcte Park, 1930, 1931, $1933,1934,1935$ (in pert), by month 32
--- 15. Attendence at Mount Mitchell State Park, 1930, 1931, 1933, 1934, 1935 (in part), by day of week 33
--- 16. Attendance at Mount Mitchell State Park, 1930, 1931, 1933,1934 , by year 34
-- 17. Fort Macon, attendance, 1038, by month 39
… 18. Fort Viecon, attendence by month, 10,30-1932, 1935-1938 41
--- 19. Fort Mecon, attendance by day of week, 1930-1932, 1935-1938 42
--- 20. Fort Macon, attendance by years, 1930-1932, 1935-1938 43
f.ppendix 4. Number of persons, cars: and persons per car attending North Carolina paiks, 193848
.-- 5. Park attendance, by age groups; checkers' records and patrons' statemerts, 193849
--- 6. Park attendance, by age groups, by months, 1938, 50
--- 7. Park patrons' vacations 51
--- mileage, by income groups among perk patrons 51
--- months used by park petrons 26
Vacations, park patrons' 25
--, where spent by park patrons 27
Weather, effect upor attendance 13, 14, G5
Week-dcys, attendence by $10,11, G 3$
W. P. A. ussistance 2


[^0]:    * See Appenálx 1: page 44 for an analysis showing the accuracy of the spot-week method

[^1]:    * Under $\$ 600, \$ 600-\$ 1000$, $\$ 1000-\$ 2500$ and over $\$ 2500$.

[^2]:    Assisted by WPis 665-32-3-336

[^3]:    * Active-use parks secure this percentige within thirty miles, Table 11 ind Grrph 11.

